

## SOCIAL AND PERSONAL

## A Hint of Life.

Don't look for the flaws as you go through life;  
And even when you find them,  
It is wise and kind to be somewhat blind.  
And look for the virtues behind them;  
For the cloudiest night has a hint of light  
Somewhere in the shadows hiding.  
It is better by far to hunt for a star  
Than the spot on the sun ablazing.

The world will never adjust itself  
To suit your whims to the letter;  
Some things must go wrong your whole  
life long;  
And the sooner you know it the better,  
It is folly to fight with the infinite,  
And to go under at last in the struggle;  
The wisest man shapes into God's good  
plan.  
As the water shapes into a vessel.  
—Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

## Would Have Gotten Flowers.

The Richmond Chapter, Daughters of the Confederacy, regretted very much to hear yesterday that the Hon. John G. Goode, president of the Constitutional Convention, would not attend its first reunion, held in Masonic Temple last night.

Mr. Goode is an honorary member of the chapter, and its members had desired, in token of their appreciation for his steadfast and loyal devotion to Virginia and the Confederacy, to send him as fragrant symbols of the chapter colors, a sheaf of red and white roses, which Governor Montague had consented to present. The roses will be blooming always for Mr. Goode, whenever he comes to Richmond, so the Daughters say, who are ever mindful of the sympathy he has always shown, and the valuable help he has always extended in the memorial work that they carry on as their greatest pleasure and highest duty.

## At the "Booke Shope."

For the lover of books and antiques no pleasanter loitering place can be found than the "Booke Shope," at No. 110 Franklin Street, where the attraction of sales for all day and of a social cup of tea from 4 to 7 o'clock draws a pleasant crowd of visitors this week.

Yesterday Mrs. Patterson and ladies of the Sheltering Arms Circle received with Mrs. Preston Cocks and Mrs. Charles Whitlock, of the Belle Harrison Circle; the Misses Edwards, of the Loving Circle; Mrs. Munday, Mrs. Nelson and Mrs. King, of the Woodbridge Memorial Circle.

In charge of the tea room was Miss Sarah Baughman and her friends, Miss Mary Drake, Miss Bessie Watson, of the Belle Harrison Circle, Mrs. D. T. Williams, Miss Josephine Budd, of Petersburg; Miss Nannie Waddill, Miss Nellie Gordon, Miss Mollie Bridges, of Ashland, Va.; Miss Mary Dwyer, Miss Lucy Dwyer, Miss Nora Houston and Miss Avis Grant. These young ladies rendered the serving of tea and muffins a delight for those whom they served.

**Kate Wheelock Whist Club.**  
The Kate Wheelock Whist Club met Wednesday afternoon, with Mrs. Willard Craig. Those scoring north and south were Mrs. Craig and Mrs. E. A. Shepherd; east and west, Mrs. Franklin and Mrs. R. G. Nelson. The club will meet next week with Mrs. Williams, at No. 210 East Franklin Street.

## Shamrock Tea.

The Ladies Benevolent Society of the Second Presbyterian Church will celebrate St. Patrick's Day and give pleasure to a number of their friends, by holding a "Shamrock Tea" in the chapel of the church, at 8:30 o'clock. An attractive program with musical and other features has been arranged by Mrs. D. T. Williams, chairman of the Refreshment Committee, and other ladies in charge.

The Young Girls' Society, of which Miss Ella Binford is president, will have a table on which aprons, stocks and other fancy and useful articles will be displayed for sale.

## Monthly Meeting of Dames.

The regular monthly meeting of the Colonial Dames will be held March 22, in the home of Mrs. Herbert A. Claiborne, No. 69 West Grace Street, at 4:30 o'clock P. M.

**Mr. and Mrs. Jacobes Honored.**  
Mr. and Mrs. S. B. Adkins, of No. 518 West Grace Street, entertained at an elegant dinner party last evening, in honor of Mr. and Mrs. W. Harrison Jacobes, of Clarksburg, W. Va. Guests to meet with Mr. and Mrs. Jacobes were Mr. and Mrs. H. Clay Lyle, Miss Julia Williams, and Messrs. E. W. Gates, Hawthorn Elson and B. B. Van Buran.

Mrs. D. W. G. Vaughn, of Floyd Avenue, was the charming hostess of a delightful luncheon given Wednesday. Her sister, Mrs. Jacobes, was the guest of honor on this occasion.

## Annual Board Meeting.

The annual meeting of the Board of the Retreat for the Sick was held from 11 A. M. to 2 P. M. yesterday.

Mrs. Annie E. Warren was re-elected president of the board. Other officers, representing different churches that were elected, included Mrs. D. W. Mosley, of the Christian Church; first vice-president, Mrs. Anna F. Rahm, of the Episcopal Church; second vice-president, Mrs. H. V. Shelton, of the Baptist Church; third vice-president, Mrs. W. J. Blunt, of the Presbyterian Church; fourth vice-president, Mrs. W. F. Richardson, of the Methodist Episcopal Church; fifth vice-president, Mrs. J. M. Rosenbaum, of the Hebrew Church; sixth vice-president, Mrs. W. N. Hamlet, recording secretary; Mrs. W. S. Murray, assistant recording secretary; Mrs. Minnie Polkes, corresponding secretary; Mrs. Jefferson Reynolds, assistant corresponding secretary; Mrs. Jack Temple, treasurer.

**Recital at Woman's Club.**  
Mrs. W. E. Thurston will direct a recital at the audience room of the Woman's Club this evening, beginning at 8:20 o'clock.

The entertainment is under the direction of the Christian Woman's Board of Missions of Seventh Street Christian Church. A very attractive program will be rendered by the following pupils of Mrs. Thurston's school: Misses Eula Bailey, Beulah Anthony, Myrtle Owen, Maggie Bryant, Ida Dillard, Gladys Neale, Gertrude Miller, Pearl Lichtenstein, Marie Anderson, Jean Field, Marguerite Stolz, Evelyn Richardson and Mr. Julian Lichtenstein.

## Monticello to be Opened.

Monticello, the historic home of Thomas Jefferson, near Charlottesville, will be opened by its owner, the Hon. Jefferson M. Levy, of New York, in honor of the installation of the president of the University of Virginia, Dr. E. A. Alderman, on April 18th, the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the University. Mr. Levy will entertain his friends, who attend the ceremony, at Monticello.

## Hodges-Byrd.

Miss Ethel Virginia Byrd, daughter of Mr. Mary P. Byrd, of No. 322 Lincoln Street, Portsmouth, and Mr. Herbert Richard Hodges, of Portsmouth, were married Wednesday night, at the home of the bride's mother, by the Rev. J. H. Joffe, pastor of the Wright Memorial M. E. Church. A large number of relatives and friends witnessed the ceremony, and a reception was held after the marriage.

## Taylor-Williams.

Miss Mamie Edna Williams and Mr. Karl Dixon Taylor were united in matrimony at the home of the bride, No. 205 West Highland Avenue, Brambleton, Norfolk, at 7 o'clock Wednesday night by the Rev. J. H. Joffe. The parlor was tastefully and elaborately decorated in honor of the event, and the ceremony was witnessed by quite a large number of the friends of the bride and groom. A handsome reception followed the wedding.

## Epes-Yerby.

Miss Grace Darling Yerby, of Fredericksburg, and Mr. Frank Epes, of Blackstone, were quietly married Wednesday afternoon, at the rectory of St. John's Episcopal Church, Petersburg. Miss Evelyn Epes, sister of the groom, was maid of honor, and Mr. Watts Manson was best man. The bride wore a gown of tan broadcloth, with hat and gloves to match. Mrs. Epes was given in a black net over red tulle, and wore a large picture hat. Mr. and Mrs. Epes left for a Northern trip.

## Frost-Stokes.

Miss Lillie E. Stokes, daughter of the late George W. Stokes, of Princess Anne county, and Mr. Thos. Frost, of Blackwater, were married Wednesday night at the home of the bride's sister, Mrs. B. F.

## TAKE (1) ONE

done and you'll find it the greatest temptation to repeat it. Nothing quiets the NERVES, imparts STRENGTH and VIGOR to the body and mind like Polk Miller's Celery Sarsaparilla Compound. It purifies the BLOOD. The best and most agreeable SPRING TONIC you can take. Sold at either store. Price, 50c.

POLK MILLER DRUG COMPANY.  
POLK MILLER-CHILDREY CO.

## POEMS YOU OUGHT TO KNOW

Whatever your occupation may be, and however crowded your hours with affairs, do not fail to secure at least a few minutes every day for refreshment of your inner life with a bit of poetry.—Professor Charles Eliot Norton.

No. 445.

## KNOW YE THE LAND.

By LORD BYRON.

The following lines are the introductory portion of the poem entitled "The Bride of Abydos." Other selections from Byron, together with his portrait, autograph and biographical sketch, have already been printed in this series. "Gul" means "Rose."



NOW ye the land where the cypress and myrtle  
Are emblems of deeds that are done in their clime;  
Where the rage of the vulture the love of the turtle,  
Now melt into sorrow, now madden to crime;  
Know ye the land of the cedar and vine,  
Where the flowers ever blossom, the beams ever shiue;  
Where the light-wings of Zephyr, oppressed with perfume  
Wax faint o'er the gardens of Gul in her bloom;  
Where the citron and olive are fairest of fruit,  
And the voice of the nightingale never is mute;

Where the tints of the earth, and the hues of the sky,  
In color though varied, in beauty may vie,  
And the purple of ocean is deepest in dye;  
Where the virgins are soft as the roses they twine,  
And all, save the spirit of man, is divine?  
'Tis the clime of the east; 'tis the land of the sun—  
Can he smile on such deeds as his children have done?  
O! wild as the accents of lovers' farewell  
Are the hearts which they bear, and the tales which they tell.

This series began in The Times-Dispatch Sunday, October 11, 1933. One is published each day.

## The Times-Dispatch Patterns.

LADIES' WRAPPER  
OR  
HOME GOWN.

No. 2170—This graceful wrapper would make up effectively in challe, cashmere or any similar wool material, in lawn, dimity or any pretty washable fabric. Its characteristic feature is the big cape collar which gives a broad shoulder effect and which always is becoming. The model is a simple as well as attractive one and is joined to the lower edge. The sleeves are the moderately full ones with shaped cuffs that are by far the most satisfactory for morning wear, and the neck is finished with the always comfortable roll-over collar. For a lady of medium size the wrapper will require 11 yards of material 27, 8-12 yards 32, or 6-14 yards 44 inches wide. The pattern No. 2170 is cut for sizes 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 inch bust.

Pattern No. 2170—Sizes 32 to 40 Bust.  
Send 10 cents to obtain this pattern, postpaid, and the size, name and address to THE TIMES-DISPATCH PATTERN DEPT., Richmond, Va.

No. 2170.

Size.....  
Name.....  
Address.....

Thurston's school: Misses Eula Bailey, Beulah Anthony, Myrtle Owen, Maggie Bryant, Ida Dillard, Gladys Neale, Gertrude Miller, Pearl Lichtenstein, Marie Anderson, Jean Field, Marguerite Stolz, Evelyn Richardson and Mr. Julian Lichtenstein.

## Monticello to be Opened.

Monticello, the historic home of Thomas Jefferson, near Charlottesville, will be opened by its owner, the Hon. Jefferson M. Levy, of New York, in honor of the installation of the president of the University of Virginia, Dr. E. A. Alderman, on April 18th, the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the University. Mr. Levy will entertain his friends, who attend the ceremony, at Monticello.

## Hodges-Byrd.

Miss Ethel Virginia Byrd, daughter of Mr. Mary P. Byrd, of No. 322 Lincoln Street, Portsmouth, and Mr. Herbert Richard Hodges, of Portsmouth, were married Wednesday night, at the home of the bride's mother, by the Rev. J. H. Joffe, pastor of the Wright Memorial M. E. Church. A large number of relatives and friends witnessed the ceremony, and a reception was held after the marriage.

## Taylor-Williams.

Miss Mamie Edna Williams and Mr. Karl Dixon Taylor were united in matrimony at the home of the bride, No. 205 West Highland Avenue, Brambleton, Norfolk, at 7 o'clock Wednesday night by the Rev. J. H. Joffe. The parlor was tastefully and elaborately decorated in honor of the event, and the ceremony was witnessed by quite a large number of the friends of the bride and groom. A handsome reception followed the wedding.

## Epes-Yerby.

Miss Grace Darling Yerby, of Fredericksburg, and Mr. Frank Epes, of Blackstone, were quietly married Wednesday afternoon, at the rectory of St. John's Episcopal Church, Petersburg. Miss Evelyn Epes, sister of the groom, was maid of honor, and Mr. Watts Manson was best man. The bride wore a gown of tan broadcloth, with hat and gloves to match. Mrs. Epes was given in a black net over red tulle, and wore a large picture hat. Mr. and Mrs. Epes left for a Northern trip.

## Frost-Stokes.

Miss Lillie E. Stokes, daughter of the late George W. Stokes, of Princess Anne county, and Mr. Thos. Frost, of Blackwater, were married Wednesday night at the home of the bride's sister, Mrs. B. F.

## A FATHER GIVEN CUSTODY OF CHILD

Supreme Court of Appeals De-  
cides. Interesting Case of  
Divided Family.

## MUST TRANSMIT MESSAGES

Federal Constitution Not Appli-  
cable to Umstadter Case.  
A Local Case.

In the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia yesterday opinions were handed down in four cases, the appellate court reversing the lower courts in three of the four cases. Judge Buchanan wrote the opinion of the court in two cases, Judge Harrison in one, and Judge Whitte in another.

By far the most interesting case decided, from the standpoint of the layman, is the appeal from the ruling of a lower court in a habeas corpus proceeding, brought by a father to secure the custody of his two children, now in the custody of their mother, who had deserted her husband. In this case the court emphasizes the law which entitles the husband to the custody of his children unless it be shown that he is not capable of or fails to provide a support for his wife, and children, and that the mother is a fit and proper person to have and to care for the children.

The case in question is that of Taylor vs. Taylor, from the Circuit Court of Norfolk county, Judge George M. Harrison delivering the opinion of the court, reversing the trial court, and remanding the case for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion. In this case the husband sued out a writ of habeas corpus to secure the custody of two small children, both of whom had been taken by the mother in her abandonment of her husband's home in Cape Charles, Va. The wife, without sufficient cause, deserted her husband, carrying the children with her, and went to her brother's home. The husband vainly sought her to return, but she positively refused, whereupon he instituted the proceeding for the custody of the children. The wife set up as her defense that she was cruelly and harshly treated by her husband. The evidence in the case failed to sustain her claim, and, on the contrary, established the fact that the husband was industrious, kind, thrifty and fairly prosperous, and loved an excellent reputation in his community. The appellate court holds that there can scarcely be but one opinion under the facts and circumstances established, and that is that both the paramount right of the father and the welfare of the children demand their restoration to him, both the mother and her brother being unable to provide for them as they should be cared for.

The court expresses the hope that reflection will satisfy the respondent that her own happiness and, above all, the welfare of her children imperatively demand that she should accept her husband's invitation to return to her home, and with the view of bringing about this reconciliation, the case is remanded to the Circuit Court, with direction to enter an order requiring the prompt delivery of the older of the children, William Thomas, to the father. As to the younger child, Elizabeth, the case is directed to be continued for six months, and if within that time the wife returns with the child to her husband's home, the case will be dismissed; but if at the end of that time she has not done so, an order will be entered requiring the immediate delivery of that child to the father, if he shall desire it.

## Telegraph Company Loses.

In the case of the Postal-Telegraph Cable Company vs. Umstadter, from the Court of Law and Chancery, of Norfolk city, the opinion of the court, delivered by Judge Buchanan, is an affirmation of the judgment of the lower court. The case grew out of the recovery by the defendant in error of \$100 for the failure of the company to transmit a message delivered to one of its messenger boys by Mr. Umstadter.

The telegraph company in its appeal contends that the statute of Virginia applicable in the case was unconstitutional, in so far as it violates the Interstate Commerce clause of the Federal Constitution. The court holds that the default in this case occurred wholly within the State and not in another State, and, therefore, the case is not within the decision of the United States Supreme Court in a Georgia case which differs from this case only in the respect that in the Georgia case the message in question was sent from one point in Georgia to another, and was not delivered after transmission. The opinion of the court deals with the question of jurisdiction raised by the appellants.

## Oriental Company Wins.

In the case of the Oriental Lumber Company vs. the Blades Lumber Company, an interesting case involving the question of verbal contracts, the opinion of the court, written by Judge John A. Harrison, reversing the judgment of the Court of Law and Chancery of Norfolk city and remands the case.

In this case the Oriental Lumber Company, claiming that the Blades Lumber Company had agreed to deliver to it a certain quantity of lumber, sought to enforce the agreement.

The court holds that the Blades Lumber Company had agreed to deliver to it a certain quantity of lumber, and that the Oriental Lumber Company was entitled to the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court further holds that the Blades Lumber Company was liable for the cost of the lumber.

The court also holds that the Blades Lumber Company